

UNITED STAT: DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and True ...nark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT		ATTY, DOCKET NO.
08/920,608		To both to the	M	A-345-A
0.07.1.17.10.1			Γ	EXAMINER
		18N2/0121	<u> </u>	
KAROL M PESSIN			DEAP'ES	
U S PATENT M/S 10-1-E	OPERATIONS,	/KMP C AMEGEN CENTER	ANTONI	PAPER NOMBER
	VILLAND DRIV		1812	J
THOUSAND O	AKS CA 91321	0-1789	DATE MAILE): 01/21/98
				•
This is a communication from				
COMMISSIONER OF PATE	Coron or	lef .		
ADT CEST	-72000	OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY		
Responsive to communic	ation(s) filed on			
This action is FINAL.				
Since this application is in	n condition for allows	nce except for formal matters, prosec	ution as to the morits	le closed in
		ince except for formal matters, prosec Quayle, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	ution as to the merits	is closed in
·	•	,		
shortened statutory period			month(s), o	
ichever is longer, from the	mailing date of this co	ommunication. Failure to respond with § 133). Extensions of time may be ob	nin the period for respo	nse will cause
заррисация то весоте ава 36(a).	indoned. (35 U.S.C.	9 133). Extensions of time may be of	mained under the provi	sions of 37 CFH
sposition of Claims				
. / _				
Claim(s)			is/are per	ding in the application
Of the above, claim(s)			is/are withdra	wn from consideration
Claim(s)				is/are allowed.
				is/are rejected. is/are objected to.
Claim(s)	/2	ar	e subject to restriction	
plication Papers				
	of Draftsperson's Pat	ent Drawing Review, PTO-948.		
		is/are object	ted to by the Examine	:
The specification is object				
The oath or declaration is	objected to by the E	xaminer.		
ority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	!9			•
Acknowledgment is made	of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).	•	
All Some* N	lone of the CERTI	IFIED copies of the priority documents	have been	
received.				
received in Application	on No. (Series Code/	Serial Number)	·	
		from the International Bureau (PCT R		
*Certified copies not receiv	/ed:			·
		stic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).		
achment(s)				
Notice of Reference Cited	d. PTO-892			•
		19, Paper No(s).		
	444	10, 1 aper 140(3).		
Interview Summary, PTO	410			
Notice of Draftperson's P		w, PTO-948		



Serial Number: 08/920608

Art Unit:

1. A telephone call was made to Karol Pessin on 1-20-98 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made. Although this is a continuation application of 08/474833 in which the claims and the restriction are the same, Ms Pessin expressly requested a written restriction requirement.

- 2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-4, drawn to a method of treating excess weight, classified in classes 424 and 514, subclasses 85.2 and 2+ respectively.
 - II. Claims 5-10, drawn to DNA encoding the Ob protein and vectors, classified in classes 536 and 435, subclasses 23.5 and 320.1 respectively.
 - III. Claims 11-12, drawn to a method of refolding a partially purified Ob protein, classified in class 530, subclass 351+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions Group II and Group III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the DNA of Group II can be used other than to make the Ob protein such as its use in therapy or diagnostically. Furthermore, the protein can be made other than with the refolding method of Group III, such as its preparation from nature using various isolation/purification/ chromatographic processes; or it could be made by chemical synthesis.

It is further pointed out that inventions of Group I and III are directed to two different and distinct methods. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of inventions" in MPEP 806.05 for different/distinct processes/methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these processes/methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions. These two methods require the use of physically and functionally distinct elements, different components and steps, as well as have different starting features and different final outcomes,

alated SpI

Art Unit:

which are not required one for the other. The method of refolding the ob protein is quite distinct from a method of using the ob protein.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, which are not co-extensive, and because of the recognized divergent subject matter between the receptor and the methods of making and using the antibodies; there are different issues for the search and examination of each group; and in view of the grouping of multiple elements in Group I to satisfy the 371 practice, to search additional groups would be an undue burden on the Examiner, therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Garnette Draper at

telephone number (703) 308-4232.

GARNETTE D. DRAPER PRIMARY EXAMINER

GROUP 1800